In the matter of John W. Simpson april 19, 1890

The Bar Association of

Baltimore City,

against,

John W.Simpson

Before the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City.

To the Honorable, the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City.

The further petition of the Bar Association of Baltimore City respectfully shows:

1. That the Clerk of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City has

made a special return to the order of Court, of the 30th.of
April, 1890, directing said Clerk to serve, upon the said John W.
Simpson, on or before the 15th.day of May, 1890, a copy of the petition heretofore filed by your petitioner and a copy of the order of Court passed thereon, laying a rule upon the said John W.Simpson to show cause, on or before the 31st.day of May, 1890, why his name should not be stricken from the roll of the attorneys of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, for improper and unprofessional conduct in failing to account for money, entrust ed to him by Rachel Goodman, and for other unprofessional conduct touching said matter; that, from said special return made by said Clerk, it appears that he endeavored to make, upon said Simpson, the personal service, required by said order of the 30th.of April, 1890, but found the office of said Simpson, No.9

E. Lexington St., vacant, and was informed by the occupant of April No. 632 W. Lombard St., where the said Simpson had resided

huse, No. 632 W. Lombard St., where the said Simpson had resided, that his whereabouts was unknown; and that said Clerk also mailed to said Simpson, at Kansas City, Missouri, a copy of said petition and order, in an official envelope, upon which there was

ENGINEERS

printed; If not delivered in five days, return to James Bond,

Clerk of the Superior Court of Baltimore City, which envelope

unopened
was returned to said Clerk.

2. That your petitioner, by its said attorneys, has made diligent inquiry to ascertain the whereabouts of the said Simpson, in order that a copy of said petition and of the order of Court thereon may be served upon him, but that such inquiry has proved futile; that your petitioner is convinced and charges that the said Simpson absconded from the City of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, immediately after the action of your petitioner, at the special meeting of April 15th. 1890, referred to in the petition heretofore filed, whereby your petitioner approved the action of its Committee on Grievances, and appointed its attorneys to bring said Simpson before this Honorable Court for improper and unprofessional conduct; that said Simpson absconded before the order of this Court, of the 30th.of April, 1890, was passed, for the purpose of evading the service upon him of a copy of said order, and of delaying and embarrassing the Court in its action upon your petitioner's complaint; that he has now been absent from the City of Baltimore and State of Maryland continuously for aperiod of more than five months, during which period no trace of his whereabouts has been ascertained by the attorneys of your petitioner, or, as your petitioner is informed, by the Clerk of this Court.

Your petitioner, therefore, prays the Court

1.To pass an order, fixing some future day, on which it will determine, upon the evidence which your petitioner may produce,
whether, under the rule laid upon said John W. Simpson by the

order of the Court, of the 30th. of April, 1890, the name of said John W. Simpson shall be stricken from the roll of attorneys of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, or whether said rule shall be discharged, upon such notice, given to the said John W. Simpson, by the Clerk of this Court, by publication in such newspaper or newspapers as the Court shall direct, that the Court will will, on the day so fixed, proceed to hear and determine said matter.

2. That the Court will fix some day, upon which your petitioner, by its attorneys, may be heard in support of the prayer of this petition.

And as in duty &c.,

Thomas I. Baen, Attorneys for the Ban Association of Battenine bety

Ordered Uni Tus about application of set dam for hearing on Tuesday Uni 14th day of October at 1.30 P. m. and that the come wrift was Council for persioner of class war.

Hanny D. Harland

Before the Supreme Beuch of Ballione City The Bar Association of Batteriore City John M. Vimpson Petition of the Bar associal tion of Patteriore City. Mr. Bond Please file Insephraekand Thomas S. Jaen attorneys for the Bar association of Batterine Bily

Filed Och 7" 1890

The Honorable, the Judges of the Supreme Bench of Balto City.
In obedience to the Order of your Hons, dated the 30"
day of April 1890, directing me to serve a copy of the Jetition
of the Bar Association, and of the said Order, upon John W.
Simpson, "to show cause why his name should not be stricken
from the roll of Attorneys of the Supreme Bench,"

of May 1890 cause a copy of said fretition and order to be made and sent the same to No 9 & Lexington Street where the office of said simpson was located, and found the same vacant,

Also, sent a copy of said petition and order to #632 Whombard Street where the said himpson had resided, and was informed through an occupant of said dwelling that this whereabouts was unknown,

Also, mailed to the address of John W Simpson, Kansas leity Mo, a copy of said fretition and order, in an official Envelope, whom which was firmled the following: "If not delivered in 5 days return to James Bond, blerk of Superior bours, of Baltimore bity "Zwhich said Envelope and contents were returned unopened; all of which is respectfully submitted

May 16" 1890 Jas Bond blerk John W Simpson
Service of Copy of Orders
of Supreme Bench

Filed May 16" 1890

Ordered by the Seepneme Buch of Bustin on lection mis goin day of April 1890 wear a rule U laid upon Love W. Simpon to show cause m or hopen we 3121 day of may 1890 why his name should not be sirience from the note of The attorneys of the Dupones Buch of Bailine on leily for metoryser and metoryessimal anduct in failing to account for money intrusted to him by Ruchael Goodman and for other unpropossional conduct briching in said matter provided a copy of this muer and of the pitition of the Bar association of Baltimon ledy in The promises to sund upon the said lone W. Dempson on or before The 15th day of may 1890. by The Clima of the Propries Benche,

Hung Ottanan.
William A. Hewart

Com Dr. Sty

Mand Swand Unjuli

Bar Association of Baltimore bity John W. Simpson Order of loours Fed april 30" 1890

Filed april 30 1890

John W. Suipson & Baltiman City. The further proceedings in this matter having been read and Considered, and it appearing to the Court that the said John W. Suipson has been out of the ferris-Orchin of the Court since the parraye of the order of this Cant heaving date the Both day ofrepul, 1890, and that skind langesone his present wherealouts are unknown, and that daid himperm has lo absented himself with Kumledy that the Matter Complained of. In this Case was in Brown of being brought I the allentin of this Court It is ordered by the Courty this 14th day of October 1890 that the said John W. Lungson he and he is hereby Ruspended from the his office of an altoney of this Court until luch time as he That have made satisfactory rusever Satisfacting to the Court to the Charges that have been preferred against line an this mater. Henry D. Harlan. Zime Dru Might

Supreme Bench Baltimore leity Order of bourt, suspending John W Simpson grom Aus office of attorney. Filed Oct 14" 1890

The Bar Association of)

Baltimore City)

vs)

John W. Simpson.-)

Before the
Supreme Bench of
Baltimore City.

To the Honorable the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City:

The Petition of the Bar Association of Baltimore City, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, by Joseph Packard Jr. and Thomas S. Baer its Attorneys, respectfully shows:

- 1. That the object and purposes for which the petitioner was incorporated are "to aid in maintaining the honor and dignity of the profession of the law, to promote legal science, and to further the administration of justice", and that under the Constitution of the petitioner, divers standing committees are appointed to carry out said purposes.
- 2. That among the aforementioned Committees is the Committee on Grievances which is charged with the hearing of all Complaints which may be made in matters affecting the interest of the legal profession, and the practice of the law, and the administration of justice, and to report the same to this Association with such recommendations as they may deem advisable.
- 3. That said Committee on Grievances has reported to your petitioner that Miss Rachael Goodman, living at No. 1718 W. Franklin Street in Baltimore City, has made complaint to it that about November 1, 1888, she employed

John W. Simpson a member of the bar of this City, to examine the title to two ground rents on Etting Street in said City which she had agreed to purchase from David Stewart Esq., and to draw the necessary legal papers for said purchase, and attend to the execution, delivery and recording thereof in her behalf; that in pursuance of said employment, the said Rachael Goodman paid said John W. Simpson a fee for his services, and entrusted him as her Attorney with the sum of Eleven hundred dollars, being the amount agreed upon as the purchase money of said rents, to be held in readiness to be paid to said Stewart upon his execution and delivery of the necessary legal papers; that with the exception of the sum of One hundred dollars paid to said Stewart on account, the said John W. Simpson has never carried out the said purchase, nor accounted for the money so delivered to him; and that he has made numerous promises to her to settle the matter, but has not done so.

4. That said Committee on Grievances further reported to your petitioner that having carefully considered the said Complaint, and the answer thereto of said John W. Simpson and the statements adduced in support of the complaint, it did find cause to believe that said John W. Simpson has been guilty of grossly improper and unprofessional conduct as an Attorney, and did recommend that proceedings be instituted by your petitioner before the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City for the punishment of said John W. Simpson, which report and recommendation was approved by your petitioner at a special meeting held on

April 15, 1890; and your petitioner files herewith as part hereof marked Exhibit A, the report of its said Committee on Grievances containing the said complaint, answer and statements, with its recommendations.

WHEREFORE your petitioner prays the Court to lay a rule upon the said John W. Simpson to show cause by a certain day to be named therein why his name should not be stricken from the roll of the Attorneys of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City for improper and unprofessional conduct in failing to account for money intrusted to him by Rachael Goodman, and for other unprofessional conduct touching the said matter.

Joseph Pack and In

Thomas S. Barn purgo.

Altorneys for the Bar Association of Bretimen leity.

April 15, 1890; and your petitioner files herewith as part hereof marked Exhibit A, the report of its said Committee on Grievances containing the said complaint, answer and statements, with its recommendations.

WHEREFORE your petitioner prays the Court to lay a rule upon the said John W. Simpson to show cause by a certain day to be named therein why his name should not be stricken from the roll of the Attorneys of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City for improper and unprofessional conduct in failing to account for money intrusted to him by Rachael Goodman, and for other unprofessional conduct touching the said matter.

Homas S. Bain

Altorneys for the Bar Association of Bretuine leity.

Before the Supreme Bench Baltime City. The Bar Association of Baltime lity John W. Simpson! Mr. Clark Please file with Exhibit A. Momas S. Baer Je 9. allowers for Association of Baltinne City.

To The Bar Association
Of Baltimore City.

The Committee on Grievances respectfully reports that on Thursday, October 17th, 1889, the following complaint was filed with it:--

To The Bar Association
Of Baltimore City.

Gentlemen: --

The undersigned would respectfully call your attention to the case of John W. Simpson, Esq., now practicing at the Bar of the Supreme Bench of this City:

In or about November last, (88) Miss Rachael Goodman, living at No.1718 W. Franklin Street, having agreed to purchase two ground-rents on Etting Street in Baltimore City, from David Stewart, Esq., employed said Simpson as her Attorney to examine the title to the said rents and draw the necessary legal papers and attend to the execution, delivery and recording thereof on her behalf.

In pursuance of such employment, Miss Goodman aforesaid paid said Simpson a retainer, and entrusted said Simpson, as her Attorney aforesaid, with the purchase money of said rents, being the sum of Eleven Hundred Dollars, (\$1100.00) to be held by said Simpson, as her Attorney, in readiness to be paid to said Stewart, upon his execution and delivery of the necessary legal papers, should the title be found good.

With the exception of the sum of One hundred Dollars,

(\$100.00) paid Mr. Stewart on account, Mr. Simpson has never accounted for the money so delivered to him; he has made numerous promises to settle the matter, and admits all the facts stated above, but he does not keep his promises.

The undersigned brings this matter to the attention of your Committee, with the request that your body take such action in the matter as may seem best in your judgement.

Respectfully,

Alfred S. Niles.

A copy of the above complaint was served on Mr. Simpson on October 18th, 1889.

SECOND: That on October 31st, 1889, the following answer to said complaint was filed with the Committee:--

Baltimore, October 31st, 1889.

Robert D. Morrison, Esq., Chairman, etc., etc.

Dear Sir: --

Permit me to file this answer to the Petition laid before Committee in the matter of the Goodman investment. As I have stated to you, I received Eleven Hundred Dollars, with instructions to invest in ground-rents.

I was examining the ground-rents of Mr. David Stewart, and was about to purchase and pay for the same, (and paid One hundred Dollars on account) when I was directed not to conclude the same, owing to a judgement against Miss Goodman, which was about to be enforced and which was settled some months afterwards. Meanwhile I was directed not to let the money lie

idle, and accordingly put it out. To show that I was not responsible for all the delay and was not willfully delaying, I will further state that Mrs. Goodman, (Miss Goodman's mother) from whom she received the money did, as late as the summer, instruct me not to take the ground-rents at all, and finally agreed that I should conclude the purchase. At that time and since I have had the money out, and will secure it within a few days. I have been making efforts to secure it before now, but was delayed most unexpectedly, although acting in the most perfect good faith.

Should the Committee desire my presence in person, I will cheerfully answer any questions and produce proofs of my statements.

Very respectfully,

John W. Simpson.

THIRD: The Committee then appointed a time to hear the witnesses, but Mr. Simpson asking further time, the matter was postponed, and another time fixed. The hearing was subsequently postponed from time to time, until the 8th day of March, 1890, the Committee met for the purpose of hearing the testimony of the witnesses. Mr. Simpson received due notice of this meeting, but did not attend.

FOURTH: The Committee met at the appointed time, and having no power to admisister oaths, took the statement of Miss Rachael Goodman, which is as follows:

Testimony taken before the Committee on Grievances, March 8, 1890, in the matter of the complaint of Alfred Niles against John W. Simpson, Atty.

- Q. 1. By Mr. Morrison.

 Miss Goodman, tell, in your own way, just what you know about this matter.
- I went to see Mr. Simpson and asked him if he would buy me some A. ground rents. I told him that I had one thousand dollars that I would like to invest. He said he could not do anything with the thousand dollars, but if I would give him eleven hundred dollars, he could then buy me two ground rents which would bring me sixty-six dollars a year. They were situated out towards Pennsylvania Avenue, He told me that if I would go home and get the money and bring it down to him, he would then buy them immediately and bring me the papers. I then went home immediately and got the eleven hundred dollars and put it into his hands, counting the money out as I gave it to him. I asked him what his charges would be for buying the rents; he told me twenty-five dollars, and that he would record the deed for me, which would cost three dollars. I then gave him twenty-eight dollars more, that is, for recording the deed and for his services in buying the rents. He kept putting me off as regards getting me the deed for the property, and I kept on running to his office. I have his letters which he has been writing to me, to come to his office for. appointments, and every time that I would go there, he would put me off. So I would go to his office every time that I would receive a note from him for an appointment, but he usually was not there, and would keep me waiting.

- Q. 2. Give, as near as you can, the dates when you gave him this money.
- A. It was the latter part of October or the first of November; it has been two years this coming October; that is to say, it was in 1888.
- Q. 3. How often have you seen him in person since you trusted him with this money?
- A. On an average about four times a week; that would be his appointment, but he would put me off from one time to another, saying that he was not ready for me.
- Q. 4. How long since you last saw him?
- A. I have not seen him since last August, the latter part of August, 1889.
- Q. 5. Was anything said about the examination of this property?
- A. No, sir, he didn't say; he only said that the rents belonged to Mr. Stewart. My brother called on Mr. Stewart, and he said there was no difficulty at all, but that Mr. Simpson had paid one hundred dollars to secure them, and that he did not intend to give up the deed until the whole amount had been paid.
 - Q. 6. By Mr. Taylor.

I would like to know whether Mr. Simpson's services, for which you paid him twenty-five dollars, were understood to include searching the title?

- A. Yes, sir, and drawing the deed.

 [Miss Goodman here produced three letters and four postal cards, which she left with the Committee.]
- Q. 7. By Mr. Taylor.

Are these all the letters or other communications which you received, or are they all you have preserved?

- A. They are all I have preserved; they were thrown around, I thinking every moment, that I would get the money or the papers.
- Q. 8. By Mr. Morrison.

What authority was given to Mr. Simpson at the time you gave him the eleven hundred dollars?

- A. Only to buy the ground rents.
- Q. 9. And the money you gave him, as I understand you, was a specific amount, which it was stated was necessary for the purchase of those particular ground rents.
- A. Yes, sir, he told me eleven hundred dollars.
- Q. 10. By Mr. Taylor.

Did he merely designate the ground rents as being on Etting Street, as I understand you to refer to them, or did he also refer to them as being rents he was about to purchase from Mr. Stewart?

- A. He took me out there and showed them to me, and we went by the way of Pennsylvania Avenue. He said they belonged to Mr. David Stewart, and he intended to purchase them for me, from him.
- Q. 111. By Mr. Taylor.

What reason, if any, did he give for not completing the transaction?

- A. He never would give me any satisfactory answer; he would just say;
 "The next time you come down, the papers will be ready for you."
- Q. 12. By Mr. Taylor.

What did he say he had done with your money?

- A. He never would tell me
- Q. 113. By Mr. Taylor.

Did you ever ask him what he had done with your money?

- A. No, sir; I never did.
- Q. 14. By Mr. Williams.

In reply to Mr. Taylor's question as to whether or not you had ever asked him what he did with the money, you have stated that you did not; did he ever volunteer any information as to what he had done with the money?

- A. No, sir.
- Q. 115. I notice from one of his letters that he refers to paying you interest; did he ever say where that interest was to come from?

- A. No. sir, nor did he ever tell me where he had invested it.
- Q. 16. By Mr. Sharp.

Miss Goodman, Mr. Simpson says in his answer that he was examining the ground rents of Mr. David Stewart, and was about to purchase and pay for the same and paid one hundred dollars on account, when he was directed not to conclude the negotiations, owing to a Judgment against Miss Goodman, which was about to be enforced; is that correct?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. 17. He was so instructed?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. 18. He says the judgment was settled some months afterwards; is that correct?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. 19. Did he settle it?
- A. No, sir, he did not; the party that the judgment was against settled it.
- Q. 20. He states that he was directed not to let the money lie idle.
- A. That is not so. I went down to notify him that as the judgment had been settled, he was to proceed and let me have the papers as soon as possible.
- Q. 21. When was this?
- A. I think it was in the late fall of 1888.
- Q. 22. He further states in his answer that Mrs. Goodman, your mother, from whom you received the money, did, as late as the summer, instruct him not to take the ground rents at all; is that correct?
- A. He would not give her up the papers, and she said if he would not give me the papers, he would be compelled to pay me my money.
- 0. 23. He states in his answer, by implication, that it was your nother's money.
- A. No, sin; my mother made it a present to me; there was no contest

time before I went to see Mr. Simpson; my mother also went to see him in my interest.

- Q. 24. Miss Goodman, when did you employ Mr. Simpson?
- A. Two years ago this coming August we came here, and I employed him as may agent to purchase a house; that was in August, 1888.
- Q. 25. That is the time you gave him this money?
- A. No, sin; I didn't give it to him until the latter part of October or the first of November.
- Q. 26. How long after that was it when he reported to you about the purchase of the ground rents --- after you gave him the money?
- A. We made the bargain that day, in his office; he was to purchase them for me from Mr. Stewart; I never saw Mr. Stewart.
- Q. 27. By Mr. Williams.

 Did Mr. Simpson go with you to see the lots, the day you left the money with him?
- A. I think I went to see him before, gave the money into his hands.
- Q. 28. By Mr. Williams.

 Then I understand you were negotiating for these rents before you paid him?
- A. Yes, sir, before I gave the money into his hands.
 - Q. 29. Have you or not ever received any part of the money that you placed in Mr. Simpson's hands, or any security for it?
- A. None whatever.

1. by Mr. Rorrison.

Q. 30. By Mr. Morrison.

Did he ever get back the one hundred dollars paid to Mr. Stewart?

A. He did not.

The Committee then tookmthe statement of Alfred S. Niles, Esq., as follows:

Q. 11. By Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Niles, have you seen Mr. Simpson at any time, upon the subject-matter of this inquiry? If so, will you state what took place at any interviews you may have had with him?

- A. I have seen Mr. Simpson very frequently in regard to Miss Goodman's maney. He, at each interview, promised to pay over to me the amount of money which he had received from Miss Goodman, fixing, at each interview, the time of payment, from one day to a week after the date of the interview.

 These promises have been kept up from the date of my employment, some time last summer, until now.
- 0. 2. But have never been fulfilled?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. 3. Did you, at any time, mention to him the purpose for which you were informed the money had been placed in his hands?
- A. Yes, sir; I told him the story which Miss Goodman told ma, last summer, and which she has repeated here, to you. He acknowledged receiving the money, and with the exception of a claim made by him, which is substantially what is given in his answer, his story did not differ at all from Miss Goodman's. His claim simply was that Mrs. Goodman, or Miss Goodman had told him while negotiations were pending in regard to the ground rents, not to let the money lie idle, consequently he had loaned it out on somebody's promissory note. I asked for the name of the party who made the promissory note, and told him to put that note in my hands for collection, and his good name would be relieved, to some extent, at least. He would neither tell me the name of the party to whom he had loaned the money,

Of give no any note.

Of copy afthe Statemen's aftlies Goodman by the Miles was then bloved on the limps son, who then requested the committee to hear his statement: The Committee then asked the Simpson to affoint a time to meet the Committee to make such statement and he appointed Friday han. 21" 1890 at 3 oclock P. m at the affice of R. D. Morrisons Englished the Committee of the Committee of the Committee of the Simpson did not attend. The Committee thereupon sent to his office to request him to affect or form them, but the affice was looked and the messenger could not find the limpson.

The Committee having fully considered the complaint of and answer, and the statements of Miss Goodman and Mr. Niles, passed the following resolutions.

FIRST: RESOLVED. That this Committee find probable cause to believe John W. Simpson guilty of grossly improper and unprofessional conduct as an Attorney.

Resolved,

SECOND: That this Committee will submit a report to the Bar Association, containing the complaint, answer, statements of Miss Goodman and Mr. Niles and proceedings of the Committee in relation thereto, and that the Committee will recommend that proceedings be instituted by the Bar Association before the Sur John Bench of Baltimore City, for the pun-

The Committee on Grievances now have the honor to submit this, their report to the Bar Association of Baltimore City.

Molnoreien

Halin Williams Post Winith Archibald H. Yaylor, Then Mestant Leculary.

Supreme Bluck The Bar Association of Baltime lity John W. Simpson. Exhibit A. to petition.

JAMES BUND, Clerk of the Superior Court OF BALTIMORE CITY.



The Bar Association of)

Baltimore City)

vs)

John W. Simpson.-)

Before the
Supreme Bench of
Baltimore City.

To the Honorable the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City:

The Petition of the Bar Association of Baltimore City, a body corporate of the State of Maryland by Joseph Packard Jr. and Thomas S. Baer its Attorneys, respectfully shows:

- 1. That the object and purposes for which the petitioner was incorporated are "to aid in maintaining the honor and dignity of the profession of the law, to promote legal science, and to further the administration of justice", and that under the Constitution of the petitioner, divers standing committees are appointed to carry out said purposes.
- 2. That among the aforementioned Committees is the Committee on Grievances which is charged with the hearing of all Complaints which may be made in matters affecting the interest of the legal profession, and the practice of the law, and the administration of justice, and to repart the same to this Association with such recommendations as they may deem advisable.
- 3. That said Committee on Grievances has reported to your petitioner that Miss Rachael Goodman, living at No. 1718 W. Franklin Street in Baltimore City has made complaint to it that about November 1, 1888, she employed

John W. Simpson a member of the bar of this City to examine the title to two ground rents on Etting Street in said City which she had agreed to purchase from David Stewart Esq., and to draw the necessary legal papers for said purchase, and attend to the execution, delivery and recording thereof in her behalf; that in pursuance of said employment, the said Rachael Goodman paid said John W. Simpson a fee for his services, and entrusted him as her Attorney with the sum of Eleven hundred dollars, being the amount agreed upon as the purchase money of said rents, to be held in readiness to be paid to said Stewart upon his execution and delivery of the necessary legal papers; that with the exception of the sum of One hundred dollars paid to said Stewart on account, the said John W. Simpson has never carried out the said purchase, nor, accounted for the money so delivered to him; and that he has made numerous promises to her to settle the matter, but has not done so.

ed the said Complaint, and the answer thereto of said

John W. Simpson and the statements adduced in support of

the complaint, it did find cause to believe that said

John W. Simpson has been guilty of grossly improper and

unprofessional conduct as an Attorney, and did recommend

that proceedings be instituted by your petitioner before

the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City for the punishment of

said John W. Simpson, which report and recommendation was

approved by your petitioner at a special meeting held on

That said Committee on Grievances further re-

April 15, 1890; and your petitioner files herewith as part hereof marked Exhibit A, the report of its said Committee on Grievances containing the said complaint, answer and statements, with its recommendations.

WHEREFORE your petitioner prays the Court to lay a rule upon the said John W. Simpson to show cause by a certain day to be named therein why his name should not be stricken from the roll of the Attorneys of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City for improper and unprofessional conduct in failing to account for money intrusted to him by Rachael Goodman, and for other unprofessional conduct touching the said matter.

Themas S. Baer

allongs for the Bankesociation

State of Maryland & Aboutino as. Baltimore leity set,

I hereby certify. That the aforegoing is truly taken from the Record of Proceedings of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore bity, in the therein named cause

In Testic sery whereof, I hereto set my hand and affin the Seal of the said Sepreme Bench, this set day of May a.D. 1890 Jas Bond blerk 9 & Lexington 632 ar. Elmbard

Petition of The Bar Association of Baltimore City John W Simpson

loofey

Ordered by the Supreme Bench of Baltimore bity this 30th day of April 1890. That a rule be laid upon John W. Simpson to show cause on or before the 31st day of May 1890, why his name should not be stricken from the roll of attorneys of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore leity for improper and unprofessional conduct in failing to account for money intrusted to him by Rachael Goodman and for other unprofessional conduct touching the said matter provided a copy of this order and of the gretition of the Bar Association of Baltimore leity in the greenises be served upon the said John W. Direction on or before the 15th day of May 1890, by the Colerk of the Supreme Bench, (signed) Henry D. Harlan

William a Stewart Edwd Duffy lo E, Thelps Danl Girand Wright

True Copy Test Jas Bond blerk

1890

The Bar Association of Baltimore bity

John W. Simpson

Order of bourk

Copy